6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

[XII century]

and hence, no group support could be found if a leader had attempted to form a centralized political authority or an imperial system over the whole area. The old Russian Chronicle of Kiev (12th century) describing a tribe with such a culture (the Polians) states that among them each kindred group (*rod*) lived in its own separate locality and had its own government.[4]

In a like manner, principles of dignity and moderation, as well as personal autonomy and lack of coerciveness, prevailed in family relations of these people. The Chronicle, for instance, states:

> The Polians had customs of their fathers, customs mild and peaceful (*krotok i tikh*); they showed a kind of reserve (*stydenie*) towards their daughters-in-law (*snokha*) and their sisters, towards their mothers and their parents, towards their fathers-in-law and their brothers-in-law; to all of the persons named they showed great reserve. They had marriage cusoms: the bridegroom did not go to seek his bride; she was taken to him in the evening, and the following morning they brought what belonged to her (*chto vdaduche*).[5]

It appears that the family organization of the Polians rested on mutual respect of all family members; that the bride brought the dowry which remained her personal property; that she might have had the initiative in wooing. This contention is supported by other evidence. Cosmas Pragensis, for instance, speaking of the old Bohemian Slavs, states: "It is not the men who choose the maids, but the maids themselves who take the husbands they like, and when they like."[6] A French writer who visited Ukraine in the seventeenth century wrote: "In Ukraine, contrary to the customs of all other nations, the husbands do not choose their wives, but are themselves chosen by their future consorts."[7]

There is also other evidence concerning some matriarchal traits of the early Slavs.[8] Throughout ages, women of the plains betwen the Dnieper and the Volga maintained property rights over their dowries and also over income from vegetables, poultry, dairy products and yarn that they produced and sold, though such rights were not recognized to men.[9] Although a woman in Russia did not have any claim to the property of her father or her brother, and only a limited right to that of her husband, she had the privilege, denied to a man, of saving and building up a

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

korobka (chest) of her own. When a girl married, she took her korobka, together with the property given her by her father or brothers, to her new home as a dowry and was allowed to dispose freely of it. At the same time her husband was not responsible for her debts.[10] When a married woman died, if childless, her korobka, as a rule, returned to her mother (matrilineal succession) and only if her mother was not alive, to her father. In some provinces the husband would inherit his wife's property if he lived with her four years or more.[11] If she had children, her property was inherited by both sons and daughters equally.[12]

Matriarchal traits are evident in contemporary folk philosophy and many folk customs in the Bielorussian villages as well as in some parts of the Ukraine. In the oral poetry of these people, for instance, the sun is represented as a female who is wooing the moon, her bridegroom. In some songs of these peasant folk the maidens contend with the male youths in duels and defeat them.[13] Even today in some of these regions it is often the girls who take the initiative in finding their suitors. During harvest festivals, it is the maidens who play the leading part. Traces of the capture of the bridegroom still persist in the folk customs of the Ukraine. In Ukrainian and Bielorussian folk poetry women, especially the mother, play a very significant role, while the place of the father is less outstanding. In popular opinion in this area, the consent of the mother in the marriage of a daughter is considered more important than that of the father.

Marriage among the Old-Slavonic peasant folk was endogamous within the village community and perhaps even within the joint household community (*verv, zadruga*)—not unlike in the Croatian zadruga of our days.[14] There was also, apparently, a particularly developed brother-sister attachment as is manifested by brother-sister incest which seems to have taken place occasionally in some Russian regions until recently.[15] There were, therefore, abundant opportunities for emotional attachments in the Old-Slavonic family, since there were no external political, economic, or social pressures that might have disturbed internal equalitarian family relationships. Such relationships have persisted until present times in certain parts of Ukraine:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF| Great Russia RF|

In a similar manner the old Kiev Chronicle points out the cultural differences between a number of Slavic-speaking tribes, such as the Polians—the "field-people," and the Drevlians (Drevlyane)—the "inhabitants of the forests," in the middle Dnieper basin. While the former are described as peaceful and mild, organized along egalitarian lines, the latter are represented as ferocious and wild, organized along monarchial, predatory, warlike, and polygynic principles. The Drevlians, says the Chronicle, ". . . lived like beasts; friends killed one another (*ubivahu drug druga*) . . . no marriage took place amongst them, but they captured young girls on the banks of the rivers."[6] And as for some other tribes, such as the Radimichi, the Vyatichi, and the Sever, the Chronicle says that ". . . shameful things occurred amongst them between fathers and daughters-in-law . . . there was no marriage . . . but the villagers would get together for dancing and satanic games, and there they captured their wives . . . they had generally two or three wives . . . they burned their dead."[7]

It is to be expected that under such circumstances cultural dualism and internal conflict and tension occurred within many individual families in this area. A Slavonic woman as wife or concubine of a Turco-Mongol horse-breeder and warrior might know nothing about his nomadic and predatory way of life, about horses and mares, about weapons, wagons and tents. She might therefore introduce into her new family agricultural techniques and a more settled way of life.

Being raised in an equalitarian society with some matriarchal traits, and with emphasis on self-respect and personal autonomy, a Slavonic woman would not be inclined to be completely submissive to her Turco-Mongol husband. Following child rearing customs of her own society the Slavonic woman would tend to remain close to her children, would teach them Slavonic speech, and might even be in a position to give them protection from the arbitrariness and impulsiveness of their warlike father. Such a situation reinforced and even magnified the traditional distance between the Turco-Mongol father and the members of his family.

At the same time the invader would insist on a subordinate

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

role of the women and children in his family and on complete subjection of all people under his control. To accept anything else would have been contrary to his view of life, to everything he stood for. It would have conflicted with his temper and his character to have acted differently. It might have meant not only loss of face but loss of power as well.

The invader was therefore likely to maintain his social distance, to resort to physical force and violence, to the *knut*,[8] to impose his dominance on and to expect unconditional obedience from all the members of his household as well as from all others who were settled and worked on the land which he had conquered and which he controlled. He was backed in such attitudes and practices by the traditional philosophy of the steppe warriors which tells them that might is right and that only unchallenged power imposed by means of fear and awe brings personal satisfaction and security.

Such conflicting marital and social philosophies, however, provoked intense social conflicts, witnessed, for instance, by the history of Slav-Avar relations. The oppressed Slavonic concubines and wives, together with their children, tended to revolt against their tyrannical and inscrutable Avar husbands and fathers:

> The Chunen [Avars] came every year to the Slavs to spend the winter among them, and abuse the wives and daughters of the Slavs. . . . But the sons of the Chunen men and the wives and maidens of the Wenden [Slavs] did not tolerate this oppression; they refused to obey the Chunen and started an uprising.[9]

Such resolute and fighting women have been perhaps personified in Russian epic narratives by Polenitsi (steppe women), the female warriors. The physical strength of these Russian Amazons is represented as being greater than that of the Bogatyri, the legendary heroes. Polenitsi are pictured as daring, bold women, who fight, torture, maim and kill the Bogatyri. But they also invite these heroes to sleep with them and resort to various tricks or to sheer force to coerce the Bogatyri to take them in marriage.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

These feuds did not affect only the relations between local lords; intense strifes and vendettas were flourishing within the family of each one of the princes. Struggle for power and expansion often caused fratricidal warfare among the brothers after the death of their father. The old chronicles and other historical documents are full of examples of such family feuds. Murder, torture and blinding among the brothers and even between fathers and sons apparently were frequent.[20] The life of each one of these local potentates was spent in perpetual warfare, in feuding, and in plundering adventures.[21]

Power-thirstiness, factionalism, and rule of crude force prevailed among these petty rulers in no lesser way than among their nomadic predecessors and overlords. The internal system of rule on the domains of each prince was not more advanced. As the Russian written laws of that period testify, the killing of prince's representatives on the part of the peasants must have been frequent. City populace often rose in riots and revolutionary outbursts against the oppressive conditions imposed by these lords.[22] It was such conditions of physical, social and emotional insecurity that favored perpetuation of the institutions, practices, and other behavior traits which were introduced by the nomadic invaders and conquerors.

III

The changes that in the course of several centuries were taking place in social and psychological structure of the Old-Slavonic world as a result of the imposition of the rule of the nomadic warriors seem to have been well reflected in the Great-Russian folklore, especially in its epic legends. The military, the peasants, the burghers, their conflicts and their character traits are personified in these narratives by a number of popular heroes.[23]

The general picture which these folk documents present shows that the social stability which existed in the Old-Slavonic society was completely shattered as a result of nomadic invasions and conquests. The invading warriors not only caused great havoc but they provoked rapid and fundamental changes in the structure of the old society. Moreover the social disorganization and the political and economic instability that resulted out of these

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

another instrument at the disposal of the father in imposing

discipline on his son consisted of threat of disinheritance and banishment. If an unmarried son left the paternal house during the lifetime of his father to establish his own separate household, the father was not obliged to give him anything and might even let him go "with nothing but his cross" (*s odnim krestom*).[8] But if a married son left with his father's consent, it was the privilege of the father to determine what his share should be.[9] Also in his testamentary disposition, the father was entitled to dispose of family property at will. The father also had the right to disinherit his son and chase him away from home as a punishment for bad behavior, especially disobedience.[10] He also had the power to select the disobedient son for military conscription. According to some sources the father had the right to sell his son "four times."[11] He might show predilection in testamentary disposition.[12] Many tales tell of a father's favoritism toward an obedient son.[13]

But the way the father used most often to impose his will and assert his power was coercion (*prinuzhdenie*) by means of physical beating (*poboi*). The horse whip and the birch rod (*rozga*) were used freely in family relations. The *Domostroy*, a code of Great-Russian family practices and ethics of the urban strata compiled and edited in the sixteenth century by Priest Sylvester, a councillor and confessor of Ivan the Terrible, prescribes in detail the application of corporal punishment as a sanction of the father's authority and rule:

> Beat your son in his youth, and he will comfort you in your old age . . . And do not weaken in beating the child. Beating with a rod will not kill him, but will make him healthier . . . If you will be weak in his childhood, he will make you suffer when he grows up . . . And give him no power in youth but crush his ribs while he is growing, because when he is big he will not obey you, and you will feel annoyed and ill at heart, and your house will be ruined . . . and your enemies will rejoice at your misfortune.[14]

The popular philosophy of life as expressed in the Great-Russian folk proverbs approves of the teachings of the Domostroy. "If God gives you sons, don't be lazy, teach them and beat them"; "If he did not obey his father, he will obey the whip,"

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

593 861 the people would say. Hence, made secure by the prevailing philosophy of life, upheld by court decisions and supported by Church teachings on the supernatural sanction of his will, the father might be tempted to take advantage of his unlimited power and to expose his son to excessively severe and humiliating treatment. "I had born you and I shall kill you," said Taras Bulba to his son and shot him to death.[15]

593 The father might also take advantage of his uncontrolled power in the use of family property and funds. He might gamble them away, spend them on debauchery, or bring the family to ruin as a result of drunkenness or mismanagement. Such incidents in Russian families are often described in autobiographies and other writings of Russian men of letters. It is characteristic of Great-Russian family relations that the other family members were not expected to complain against such extreme abuse of paternal authority.[16] Hence in all strata of Russian society, there was a tendency to accept anything the father did, even the most degrading treatment, as his paternal prerogative. Even if a father had ruined his family because of gambling or lechery he was still held in reverence both by his society and by his children.[17]

606 835 Occasionally, particularly among the peasants, the father might take sexual advantage of his daughters-in-law, a practice which became known as *snokhachestvo* (*snokha* is daughter-in-law). This habit, which was already noticed by the writer of the Kiev Chronicle, was favored by the frequent absences of married sons who spent a part of the year in the city as workers or who were away from home for many years, or indefinitely, when conscripted for military duty. "The more women in the house, the more sin" (*Bolshe bab v semie, bolshe greha*),[18] the people would comment.

593 562 As much as the traditions of the steppe warriors prevailed in the Great-Russian patriarchal family the wife was placed on an equal footing with her children in relation to her husband. She had to show absolute submission and blind obedience to her husband. "The husband is father to his wife" (*Muzh zhene otets*);[19] "Christ is the head of the Church, the husband that of

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

his wife"; "The husband is the law unto his wife," the proverbs say. As a result of such a view of husband-wife relations, the husband had the right and duty to apply brutal force to his wife as a means of discipline, the same as to his children. "It is woman's fate to be always beaten," the people would say.[20]

The description of folk life in the eastern parts of Russia corroborate this attitude toward wives as expressed in popular sayings. The informants tell of the "miserable fate of the women" (*nepriglyadnaya uchast zheny*),[21] the constant fights of husband and wife (*muzh deretsya s zhenoi*), and the thrashing (*poboi*) to which the wives were exposed on the part of their husbands. In case of adultery the punishment for the woman was "merciless beating" (*neshchadnoe bitie*) or strangling (*udushenie*).[22]

Domostroy, which was under the influence of Church teachings, agrees with this philosophy and practices and even offers elaborate and detailed precepts to the husband about how to treat his wife ". . . if the wife is not afraid of the punishment and does not follow the instructions, the husband should beat her." According to Domostroy only if the wife is blindly and unconditionally submissive "everything will run smoothly in the family." The wife must do everything "to please her husband and God and she must listen to him with fear and awe."[23]

Domostroy was compiled primarily for the urban classes of the Czardom. Its rules reflect a certain deterioration in the status of women as they moved from the peasant to the urban level. In the cities, especially among the merchants, the women were confined to the *terem* (gyneceum) and had less opportunity to work and earn for themselves. In the urban environment, the Turco-Mongol influences were therefore reinforced.

In the rural areas the women retained their role in economic production. The peasant women were thus enabled to retain some of the the Old-Slavonic traditions; they often knew how to assert themselves and influence family affairs. In a like manner, with the increasing opportunities for schooling in urban centers, a growing number of city women emancipated themselves from family ties and became economically and socially independent. In such circumstances also many women in the urban

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

middle and upper strata knew how to assert themselves and increase their role and influence, thus reviving the Old-Slavonic traditions.

III

Though the father was to be severe and strict, he was expected also to love his wife and his children. Just like God in Heaven, father's duty was to inflict harsh punishment, but he was also to show compassion, kindness, understanding and constant solicitude for the members of his household. He was responsible before God and men for the failings and misdeeds of his family members, and he was therefore to look after their well-being and salvation. Thus love and violence were often mingled in the Great-Russian family. A number of folk sayings express this ambivalent trait of attachment and hostility when referring to the attitudes and behavior of the father. "To love one's wife is to hold her in terror" (*Lyubit zhenu-derzhat grozu*); "Whom I love I thrash" (*Kovo lyublyu togo i biyu*).[24]

One of the basic underlying motives in the father's violence seems to have been his self-seeking and urge for dominance as well as a need for succor. "Beat your wife oftener, it will be useful for the future," the men would say. The Domostroy justifies child beating in a similar manner ". . . he will comfort you in your old age and will give beauty to your soul. . . . and he will make you happy when he grows up. . . . and your enemies will envy you. If you will be weak in his childhood, he will make you suffer when he grows up; will set your soul on edge."[25]

There is in some proverbs also an indication of an expectation of "masochistic" indulgence according to which violence and deprivation would arouse love. "Not to beat one's wife is not to be loved by her" (*zhenu ne bit i milu ne byt*),[26] the people would say. In a folk song, for instance, the husband buys gifts for his wife, but it is of no avail. When the husband buys a knut and gives his wife a beating with it, it is only then that she responds with love. In another folk song the wife boasts the knuting "is an honor to me and is not painful" (*Mne to za chest, ne bolno.*)[27]

Though the father felt dependent upon his wife and children

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

and was expected to love his family, he was to remain detached and distant. Such paternal behavior was particularly noticeable in the urban strata where both the Turco-Mongol and the Church influences were stronger. "Do not smile at him, do not play with him" is the advice of the Domostroy concerning father-son relations.[28] The father was not supposed to show any outward signs of emotion, neither anger nor affection toward his wife, children, or his servants. Even during the beating the father was expected to remain cold and detached, according to the Domostroy. His love was to be of a charitable and compassionate character. Any kind of personal closeness and familiarity with his wife or children might have undermined an authority that was based on sternness, fear and awe.

A number of autobiographies and other writings of Russian men of letters, as well as the accounts given by foreign observers, stress this duality in the behavior of the father. He is pictured as compassionate, kind and goodhearted, but also as detached, harsh and abusive.[29] A number of these documents tell about the *groza* (terror) in which the father or the grandfather had held all his dependents; about his detachment even when playing with children, and about his inability to be with them on comradely terms or to laugh with them. They often tell about the difficulties the children experienced in attempting to approach their father on intimate and friendly terms, though they felt that he had a "good heart" and was "compassionate":

> My father, true to the family tradition, took up the profession of soldiering . . . To his children he was a comparative stranger but we were terrified of him. We only saw him at meals; he spent the rest of his time in his private rooms which none of us dared to enter save at his command. A masterful, violent nature, he either could not or would not control his temper, and was an object of terror to us and to his servants. However, he had a good heart. But at the period when he lived, harshness had become a moral principle. To show benevolence was to be weak, to be cruel was to be strong . . . and my father, like most men, was cast in the mould of his period. He carefully concealed his feelings under a mask of harshness. He was certainly brutal; he was also compassionate in his own way . . . At this period children, the poor and the weak, and still more the serfs, were scarcely considered to possess a soul. My father reigned, but did not govern.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Like Jupiter, he only interfered in the affairs of mortals in moments of crisis. But when he did interfere it was no laughing matter, and everybody, from cellar to attic, trembled in his shoes . . .[20]

This God-like, unapproachable, inscrutable, absolute and arbitrary power of a stern and violent but also benevolent, compassionate and solicitous father was apparently projected into the Russian supernatural world in the form of the *Domovoy*, the house spirit. According to the Great-Russian folk beliefs, the Domovoy was the protector of the house; he had patriarchal prerogatives over it, but also depended upon it. He demanded from the family all kinds of honors. At the same time he was as unpredictable in his behavior as any stereotyped family head in the Great-Russian patriarchal family system.

Thus the Domovoy was at times protective, benevolent and compassionate, but at other times he would become wicked, vindictive and mischievous. He was endowed with supernatural powers and could bring either fortune or calamity upon the family, depending upon his frequently changing moods and dispositions. It was, therefore, considered wise to address him as "Grand Father" and to propitiate and appease him by frequent offerings in viands. If such attention were shown to him he was likely to be helpful. But if he were neglected, he would become enraged and full of wrathful vengeance. In such a case, he could be atoned only by blood; the corners of the izba were sprinkled with blood of a cock that was killed for the occasion and various incantations were uttered.[21]

8
FAMILY CONFLICTS

I

THE FATHER treated his family members as wards and minors because he was responsible for their well-being, their behavior and their salvation. He had to show a constant solicitude for them (*neustannaya zabota*). The blame for their

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

failures and their sins would fall upon him. He was emotionally and socially dependent upon the members of his family, yet he had to be stern and distant to maintain his authority. 593●

At the same time, the family members were expected to completely identify themselves with the family as a whole. This submerging of the individual in the family collective was manifested, for instance, in the ideas of common family good, rooted in the Old-Slavonic principles of mutual reponsibility and mutual aid of all community members ("all for one, one for all"). The elder brothers were expected to take care of their minor brothers and of their unmarried sisters; the aged or disabled parents were in the care of their children; the father was expected to maintain his daughter-in-law if she lost her husband or if her husband were away.[1] 592

Earlier, following Mongol traditions, the family was collectively responsible for the misdeeds or crimes of any one of its members.[2] In early Russia, according to the Expanded Version of the *Pravda*, "if anyone attacks and kills another without the slightest provocation, the inhabitants of the district do not make payment for this kind of a murderer, but they shall surrender him, with his wife and children, for sentencing to banishment or imprisonment, and his home shall be given up for plundering."[3] Also later in Muscovite Russia all members of a family were considered involved in the offense of a member. [672] [681]

This complete identification with one's family and this penal philosophy of collective responsibility, of implied collective culpability and family hostages (retained in Russian police practices until nowadays) favored family self-centeredness and self-concern. There was therefore a tendency to draw a curtain of secrecy around the family in order not to expose it to accusations and to protect it from defamation. In the urban strata the master of the household was very much preoccupied with this problem. "Your neighbors will reproach you, and your enemies will rejoice at your misfortune," warns Domostroy. Such family centeredness, which was a result of the ascendency of an autocratic state, favored social isolation and lack of intimate contact with neighbors; hence, it fostered also lack of social trust. [156]

Family centrism, family isolation, and lack of trust in one's

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

592 Family centrism, family isolation, and lack of trust in one's
771 neighbor were apparently projected into the supernatural world
776 where one's own Domovoy, though at times arbitrary, ill-tempered and spiteful, was generally considered to be benevolent—bringing good luck to the household which was under his care and solicitude. The neighbor's Domovoy, on the other hand, was always a malevolent and wicked being who could never be propitiated and who was likely to steal your hay or drive away your cattle for the benefit of the home which was under his protection.
[789] The Russian peasants, therefore, developed means of defense against the neighbor's Domovoy in the form of spells and exorcisms.

156 Lack of social trust is not favorable to the development of
621 solidarity within a community. Therefore lack of group identi-
578 fication among the peasants and burghers, the same as the lack of the *esprit de corps* among the nobility, contributed to the perpetuation of the autocratic rule. Lack of communal identifications was an obstacle to the turning of group hostilities against the ruling classes. In such circumstances a great deal of personal aggressiveness had to find outlets and targets within the local community and within the family circle itself. Only when the authorities suffered crushing defeat and loss of prestige the hostilities would turn against them and mass uprisings would take place, demanding re-establishment of old communal values.

With the ascendancy of the otsovskaya system, family relations came to be organized in a hierarchical system along the lines of paternity, marriage status, seniority and sex. At one time, only married male members formed the family council (soviet). The males had priority over the females. Within each sex category the elder had priority rights over the younger. When the family was partitioned, custom demanded that the older brothers leave
[428] the ancestral home while the youngest, following Mongol tradi-
[582] tions, remained on the paternal *koren* (root).[4] In marrying the daughters it was the eldest who had to be married first.

593 In the patriarchal family, in their relations to the father, all family members were expected to accept his rule with fear and awe (*strakh*) and with humility (*smirenie*). They had to show absolute submission and blind obedience (*besprekoslovnoe povinovenie*),[5] as well as love and gratitude (*blagodarnost*).[6]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

These attitudes implied complete dependency and self-abnegation on the part of the wife and children in relation to their master. The wife and the children were expected always to speak with respect to the father, that is, in the second person plural instead of the second person singular—the way the children addressed each other or their mother. The wife did not address her husband by his first name, but by his first and second name (patronymic) which was the way less intimate acquaintances addressed each other. The children had to demonstrate their thankfulness for the father's care and solicitude by kissing his hands. Before a bride left her parental home, custom demanded that she say to her father, "God will help you for bread and salt." And he would advise her to be obedient to her new relations: "Be obedient to them the way you were obedient to me" (*slushay kak menia slushala*).[7]

Emphasis on fear and awe, obedience and gratitude was very outstanding in the Great-Russian patriarchal family relations. These feelings and attitudes had a supernatural sanction. As a result of the teachings of the Russian Orthodox Church, it was considered in popular opinion that any disobedience or disrespect of the father's will was mercilessly punished by God who brought life-long misery and misfortune for such unfilial behavior. Even after death, the soul of a disobedient and ungrateful child could hardly escape punishment in the eternal fire of hell. Many Great-Russian folktales place a great emphasis on obedience and gratitude and stress the cruel penalty and fearful fate that awaited a disobedient and ungrateful son.[8]

Such family relations in which demands of a harsh and detached, and even capricious and arbitrary father had to be answered by humility, unconditional submission, blind obedience, love and gratitude; in which family members fought over priorities and rights; where all felt dependent upon one another and isolated from the rest of the world, could not fail to provoke tensions and cause intense family antagonisms and animosities. Such tensions and conflicts became characteristic of the Great-Russian patriarchal family and were manifested in the relations between husband and wife, father and sons, between the siblings and between the in-laws.[9]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

parents and brothers, and with her sisters-in-law was not any brighter. In folk sayings the father-in-law is often referred to as "worse than a dog," and the mother-in-law as a "wicked satan." Her expectations about the treatment on the part of other in-laws were not more cheerful, as witnessed by the folk songs.[13]

When married, she soon realized that "before the husband the wife is always guilty" (*Pered muzhem zhena vsegda vinovata*). And there was no one to whom to complain or from whom to seek comfort. Her own parents and brothers were "far away" or indifferent to her fate, now that she was "cut off from the loaf" and belonged to another family. And if she did not develop an attachment to her husband or to her children, she might have sought an escape from such a difficult emotional situation in extra-marital love affairs, or in fantasies about such affairs. The Great-Russian folk songs are abundant with such themes and often justify these liaisons as a need for love and attachment which was denied to the bride in the home of the husband.[14] Extreme husband-wife antagonism as expressed by murder is occasionally the theme of Great-Russian religious sagas and more frequently the theme of folk tales[15] and of folk songs:

Against my will was I married;
I have taken an evil wife,
An evil one, not to my liking,
Neither in feeling nor in thought.
Lovingly live with her—that will I not.
Across the stream will I go,
Love will I make to the girls.
As for that wife of mine
I will go pray for her death.
Along the bank of the stream
Death, the beautiful, goes.
"Ho there! My beautiful Death!
Turn thee back again, Death!
Make an end of my wife."
Scarce had I spoken—when Death
Began her work with my wife.
Scarce had I time to look around—
Shrouded in linen white was her corpse
Struck was the stroke on the bell.[16]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

III

●593 No less intense seems to have been the tension between father and son. The son in this family was placed in a difficult position in respect to the absolute power of his father, sanctioned by the Church, by the local authorities, by the landlord, and by the law of the state. According to the Church teachings and according to the popular opinion, the parent's blessing brought good fortune and the parent's curse life-long misery. There was also fear of disinheritance, banishment, and military conscription. But there was also a strong desire for freedom and independence from an arbitrary and brutal paternal authority.

Open rebellion against this authority was not expedient, nor advisable. Leaving home without the father's consent was practically impossible because all the authorities would support the [48L] father against the son. Without father's consent the police would not issue a passport which was necessary for travelling within the country. There was also a strong emotional resistance against fighting back one's father because, according to the popular view of life, "The hands which beat the father shall never be able to earn anything." Besides, as long as the father was physically stronger the outcome of such a struggle did not look promising.

There was, however, also a tendency on the part of the son to attach himself to his father, and to identify himself with him. But since the father tended to be detached and stern and might even abuse his son, the son had difficulties in experiencing a close and warm relationship with father and to identify himself with him. And since the father was not always harsh but often good hearted, compassionate and kind, the deprivation of a friendly and intimate contact with the father was painfully felt as a rejection. The result was the development of ambivalent feelings of identification and rebellion, of love and hatred in father-son relations. "When I have a father, I feel like killing him; when I have none, I feel like buying one," was the people's saying.

A son's wounded pride and rebellion against a tyrannical and abusive father took on normally a silent and inner form, at least as long as the father remained physically stronger than his son. This inner form of revolt was sometimes manifested in a secret

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

desire for his father's death.[17] Only then was there hope for freedom. A folk maxim, for instance, says: "When the earth takes the parents, the children get their freedom." Such an extreme form of revolt, however, was not so simple because it went counter to the accepted image of the father, his supernaturally sanctioned absolute power, his care and solicitude for the welfare of all the family, and the traditional obligation of love and gratitude towards him on the part of the family members. Hence antagonistic attitudes against the father were regularly mixed with strong feelings of guilt.

Both the feeling of guilt and the fear of being rejected by the father might have perhaps been manifested in those folk tales which tell gruesome and frightful stories about children who were abandoned by their parents[18] and left at the mercy of wild beasts, frost, open sea, and in those folk tales in which the children are dismembered by their own parents and thrown away in small pieces. That the father himself sensed a potential feeling of rebelliousness on the part of his son and that he himself might have had a feeling of guilt because of his treatment of his son is witnessed by folk sayings which express a dread of old age with its dependency upon one's own children: "To pay old debts and to feed old parents are the hardest things in the world"; "One father will feed nine children sooner than nine children will feed one father"; "God take away my life rather than let me be under my son's care."[19]

There were other tensions and conflicting situations in the Great-Russian patriarchal family, particularly in the urban strata. The principle of seniority, for instance, reserved disciplinary privileges and responsibilities for the brothers in relation to their sisters, and for the senior brothers and sisters in relation to their juniors. At the same time a father's absolute power often took the form of favoritism in respect to a younger son, or to a daughter, which was counter to the established principles of seniority and therefore considered unjust. There was therefore plenty of opportunity for resentments, rivalries, jealousies, hatreds, and fights among the siblings, or between the older and the younger family members:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

● 593
578

The family was divided into two clans, the elder and the younger. The elder ones were proud, rich, all powerful, fearing none but Jupiter [father]. They had fine rooms where they could run about and play without fear of colliding with the furniture; they lived in style and despised us, and punished us. The youngsters were weak and oppressed, with only a little room as their domain; they were kept running errands and had sweets to eat only on the rare occasion when they were given a few. They were teased and were accused of lying when they were not telling lies; . . . They had none to defend them against the iniquity of the elders . . . The two clans carried on constant warfare. The elders . . . would treat the youngsters as vassals and make fun of them.[20]

In the homes of merchants and petty officials, frictions, tensions, and animosities were so outstanding a feature of family life as late as the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries, that they formed a recurrent theme in Russian belles-lettres of those days, such as in the works of Dostoyevsky and of Ostrovsky. N. Dobrolyubov, a noted Russian critic, commenting on the writings of Ostrovsky, asserted that it was [157] the system of tyranny which caused cunning, hatred, lack of justice and of human dignity in the family.[21] In a similar way Peter Kropotkin, observing family relations in various strata of Russian society in the second part of the nineteenth century, claimed that, "quite a network of habits and customs of domestic slavery, of utter disregard of human individuality, of despotism on the part of the fathers, and of hypocritical submission on that of the wives, the sons, and the daughters, had developed."[22]

9
MOTHER-CHILD ATTACHMENT

I

THOUGH the internal situation in the Great-Russian patriarchal family tended to be rather tense, the role played by the mother was likely to introduce into that family an element of moderation and emotional integration.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ment of moderation and emotional integration. In the early Slav society, mother's role in all family affairs was very significant. With the growth of the patriarchal family, one of her important duties came to be that of intercessor and of protector against the wrath of the father. In the patriarchal family the mother was not the chief disciplinarian; therefore she did not have to resort to threat, violence, privations, and humiliation as a means of discipline. Her punishments were mild and her main means of control were those of love and reasoning. Her authority and self-respect were therefore not endangered by being close to children and by being on familiar terms with them. She was always available and approachable. The children, therefore, felt much more at ease and free in the presence of their mother than in that of their father.[1]

The mother, if feeling neglected, abused or degraded by a remote and harsh husband, was likely to seek compensation for the lack of love and for wounded self-esteem by being over-protective and over-affectionate in relation to her children, expecting indulgent response from them. The son, if barred in his desire for attachment to his father or if abused and humiliated by him, might feel the more attracted to his mother as a means of emotional outlet and as compensation for feelings of rejection and humiliation.

It is this role of the mother as warm protector and close friend that has been expressed in folk sayings and other products of folk philosophy and imagination. "Fear your father, and respect your mother" says a Russian folk proverb pointing out the sharp contrast in the attitude of a child toward his father and his mother. The folk sayings emphasize also the intimate and tender bond that exists between mother and child and the importance of such close ties for the child. "Without a father the child is half orphan, without a mother a child is a complete orphan"; "Mother's beating does not hurt"; "Mother raises her hand high, but does not strike hard." Because of such close mother-child relationship, it was considered in the popular view of life that mother's influence on the child was in the long run deeper than that of the father. "What mother puts into the child's head, the father will not knock out," the people would say.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

●593 538 The Great-Russian epic legends have the same image of the mother. One of the most peculiar and significant aspects of these narratives is that in times of distress, in moments of gloom or when gripped by strong feelings of guilt it is often the mother who comes to the rescue of the *bogatyr* (legendary hero), gives him solace, helps him with advice, places her treasure at his disposal.[2] The mother is considered to be of such a great value that heroes, in the course of their feasting and drinking bouts, when boasting of their war exploits, of their horses and possessions, boast also of their mothers:

> One boasts of his good steed,
> One boasts his silken breeches,
> One boasts his villages with hamlets,
> One boasts his towns with their suburbs,
> One boasts of his dear mother,
> But the foolish one boasts of his young wife.[3]

593 771 Mother's role as a moderator *vis-à-vis* a harsh and detached father was expressed very early in the Russian religious lore. For instance, one of the most popular religious tales of early Russia was the one of the "journey of the Mother of God through the Inferno." In this story the *Bogoroditsa* (Birth-giver to God), impressed by the tortures of sinners, implored God to pardon them. At first God was implacable, but finally, as a result of Bogoroditsa's supplication, he promised some relief in their suffering.[4] In the same manner the contemporary Russian religious folk poetry often pictures the Mother of God as the "fastest helper" and as the "warm interceder":

> Mother mine—Mother Maria,
> Purest maiden—The Most Holy
> Mother of the World—Maria,
> Most holy Birthgiver to God,
> Beautiful sun,
> Purest dove,
> Mother of God,
> The fastest helper,
> The warm interceder
> Intercede, save and have mercy.[5]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

This idealized image of mother as a helper and interceder that was projected into religious lore has been manifested also in widespread Madonna worship. The cult of the Bogoroditsa was noticeably developed in Russian society from the days of its conversion to Christianity. The old Russian princes of the Kiev period invoked the help of the Mother of God, dedicated their cities to her, and wrote prayers to her.[6] Throughout many centuries Madonna icons were very widely in use and prayers to Madonna were very frequent in the religious practices of the Russian Church. Some of the most outstanding Russian Orthodox cathedrals have been dedicated to the Mother of God.

Identification with mother is seen in the often used phrase "Mother Russia" and in the word *rodina*—"mother-country." Also rivers and cities are regularly identified with mother (Mother Volga, Mother Moscow). The days in the week which are considered holy or consecrated are sometimes identified with mother, such as Mother Wednesday, Mother Friday.[7] And in Russian epic poetry, the whole earth is invariably identified with mother in the often-repeated phrase *Mat syra zemlya*—moist Mother Earth.

Of course other attachments took place in the Great-Russian family as manifested in the identification of a younger brother with his older brother and in frequent father-daughter emotional ties. There were, also, families in which mother appeared not in her expected role of close friend and protector but in that of a domineering and tyrannical despot. All such relations had their particular effects on the development of a child's personality, as we shall see on the following pages.

10
DEPENDENCE, SENSE OF GUILT, FEAR

I

WHEN a child's demand for attention and love is thwarted by a dominating and forbidding father, feelings of

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Ivan the Terrible]

In this manner popular religious ideas and practices which might have developed as a response to the interpersonal relations in the family and in the Czardom in their own turn tended to perpetuate the existing social and political order, its institutions and practices. There were, however, other aspects of interpersonal relations intrinsic to that social organization which provoked responses that tended not to perpetuate it, but to undermine it and to destroy its very foundations. These important agents of structural change in Russian society will be discussed on the following pages.

11
POWER-SEEKING, MISTRUST, AND DESTRUCTIVE AGGRESSION

I

A CHILD who has been rejected and humiliated by a stern and scornful father, but who has been spoiled by an overindulgent mother might respond to such a situation by developing an exaggerated concern for his own ego, and an extreme intolerance for privations and denials. And in case the mother cannot serve as a satisfactory substitute for rejection by the father, complete detachment from the group, and pity for an abandoned, degraded and suffering self might develop. In such circumstances also a deeply rooted suspicion of others, an unbridled desire for power, and an overwhelming hate and urge for destruction of all those who stand in one's path might take place.

The life histories of a number of Russian rulers and intelligentsia apparently show such an effect of their family environment.[1] Childhood experiences and character traits of Ivan the Terrible, for instance, provide an outstanding example. There is sufficient evidence for the contention that the strange behavior of this Czar was rooted in rejection and in alternating mistreat-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Ivan the Terrible]

[Dobrolyubov]

593 154 159 ment and indulgence to which Ivan was exposed as a child. Early in his life Ivan was left an orphan. His father died when he was four and he lost his mother four years later. As a child Ivan was reared among crouching servility as well as among arrogance, violence, and contempt. He was greatly pampered on the part of some of his tutors and courtiers, but also often deeply wounded on the part of others. Some of the boyars at the court would annoy him and insult him. They would arrest and threaten with death persons to whom Ivan was attached.

In his own writings, Ivan tells us how much he suffered because he was deprived of his attachments and frustrated in his expectations. It is possible, that it was as a result of such experiences that Ivan developed ideas of rejection, persecution and self-pity, as well as an urge for self-assertion by means of destructive aggression. He sought for himself power which was as overwhelming as that of omnipotent God and asserted himself by means of ruthless violence. "My parents never had a care for me," he claimed. He also said: "In vain I have looked for some man to have pity upon me, but have found no one. Yea, no comforter have I found, but only such as have rewarded me evil for good and hatred for love."[2] He felt emotionally very dependent upon his wife and blamed the courtiers for her early death. He himself explained his assassinations of the boyars on that ground. "Why divided ye me from my wife? Had ye not taken from me my *unitza* (heifer—young wife), never had there been the slayings of the boyars."[3] The old documents say about Ivan [157] that "He pitieth not men, nor yet yieldeth. Likewise, he loveth not contrary speech, but doth conceive anger against them who do speak it."[4] He is described by his biographers as "self-seeking, opinionated, ferocious and self-willed."

More recent evidence of the effect of rejection-indulgence is given by Dobrolyubov, one of the outstanding Russian intellectual rebels of the second part of the nineteenth century. According to his biographers and according to his own diary, Dobrolyubov was thwarted in his attachment to his father, a clergyman, who was detached, harsh and even brutal in dealings with his son. Dobrolyubov was very close to his mother, but this relation apparently did not compensate for the thwarting and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Dobrolyubov]

593 154 159

humiliating treatment which Dobrolyubov experienced at the hands of his father. As a reaction to such a family situation, Dobrolyubov developed strong needs for emotional attachment and felt very disillusioned and deeply embittered when his need for dependency was frustrated. When he was sixteen years of age this "forerunner of Bolshevism" wrote in his diary:

> No matter how many attachments I had formed in the past, always the evil fate would whisk the beloved being far away from me; and in my soul remains only the sorrowful memory and bitter realization of my despair . . . I could never live without love, without attachment to someone. This has been so ever since I remember myself. But this constant irony of fate, which makes all my hopes and dreams usually crash into dirt, constantly hardens and chills my heart, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that soon it will be both hard and cold as stone.[5]

517 156

Later, apparently, Dobrolyubov found an outlet for his repressed hostilities, in his writings in which he tended to emphasize the dark sides of Russian society ("Realm of Darkness"). He joined that group of "Nihilists" who excelled in their philosophy of extreme individualism, who attacked the existing society and devised the ways to destroy "coldbloodedly" its very foundations, including the family. It was in this ideology of "Nihilism" that Russian Anarchism as well as Bolshevism have been rooted.

000

The demand for unlimited power as a means of compensation for humiliations and deprivations and as a means of satisfying craving for acceptance and support tends to perpetuate a political system which gives one a chance to indulge such needs through relationships of absolute dominance and unconditional submission and through destructive action. Such a social and political structure, in its own turn, tends to reinforce paternal despotism and absolute obedience in the family. In this manner, just as in the society of steppe marauders, power-seeking, mistrust and destructive aggression are perpetuated, become generalized and are manifested in many social relations.

152 556 844

On the folk level desire for power was manifested, for instance, in the customs connected with childbirth. On that occasion the midwife would place the child on a sheepskin coat or furcoat so

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Belinsky]
[Nekrasov]
[Herzen]

was to convey to the masses a social message. In their literary essays they stressed the social and political ills of Russia and believed in the Westernization of their country as a way out of its social and political difficulties.

It is reported that Belinsky grew up with the feeling of revolt against the despotism of his father who tyrannized the family. Nekrasov, "at the age of 17 . . . broke with his father whom he detested even as he idolized his mother" . . . And it was Nekrasov who in his writings showed an especially "great and unfeigned compassion for the poor and the suffering" and who "idealized and worshipped the Russian people,"[1] that is, the people who have been exposed to an age long misery. In a similar manner Herzen had generalized his childhood experiences and had transferred his reactions to all human kind. As a child he showed a strong reaction against his "inaccessible" father and a deep sympathy for all those whom his father abused:

> . . . the hushed voices and noiseless steps of the servants were no sign of devotion, but of repression and fear. All impulsiveness and frankness my father disliked and called familiarity; and all display of feeling passed with him for sentimentality. And when this proud old man, with his clear understanding and sincere contempt of mankind, played this part of a passionless judge, whom did he mean to impress by the performance: A woman whose will he had broken, though she never tried to oppose him; a boy whom his own treatment drove from mere naughtiness to positive disobedience; and a score of footmen whom he did not reckon as human beings! . . . Always on his guard, discontented with everyone, he suffered when he saw the feelings he inspired in every member of the household. Smiles died away and talk stopped whenever he came into the room. Stinging mockery and cool contemptuous irony were the weapons which he could wield with the skill of an artist, and he used them equally against us and against the servants. There are few things that a growing boy resents more; and, in fact, up to the time of my imprisonment I was on bad terms with my father and carried on a petty warfare against him, with the men and maids for my allies . . . did I deserve that he should preach even the truth in a manner so repulsive to the heart of youth? His intelligence, chilled by a long life spent in a corrupt society, made him suspicious of all the world; his feelings were not warm and did not crave for reconciliation; and therefore he remained at enmity

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Herzen]
[Sophia Perovskaya]

with all his fellow creatures . . . I felt intense pity for the old man, but I could do nothing—he was inaccessible.[2]

The liberalizing influences which were penetrating Russia from the West reinforced urges of revolt against despotism as well as feelings of identification with suffering masses. By the second part of the nineteenth century the reaction against the tyrannical family environment and oppressing political system took often an extreme form. It is common knowledge that many Russian terrorists and assassins of the second part of the nineteenth century grew up exposed to constant family tensions and personal humiliations, and sought total destruction of society. Others were inclined to identify themselves with all who were abused. Thus we find the urge for destruction and identification with suffering as fundamental aspects of the ideology of Russian revolutionary movements. For instance, Kropotkin, the outstanding Russian Anarchist directly related his revolutionary activities to his identification with all those who were persecuted. He appealed to all who were exposed to maltreatment to rise against their oppressors:

> Ay, all of us together, we who suffer and are insulted daily, we are a multitude whom no man can number. We are the ocean that can embrace and swallow up all else. When we have but the will to do it, that very moment will justice be done; that very instant the tyrants of the earth shall bite the dust.[3]

Or take, for instance, Sophia Perovskaya, one of the plotters in the assassination of Czar Alexander II. According to her biographers her father was a willful despot "such as the patriarchal system alone could have produced," and her mother, "constantly humiliated and insulted," remained at home to protect the children. Thus, in her own family Perovskaya learned to hate oppression and developed her love for the oppressed and weak. For her mother, one of the down-trodden, she had a love "bordering upon adoration."[4] Catherine Breshkovskaya, another outstanding Russian revolutionary, who became known as the "little grandmother of the Russian revolution," tells us in her reminiscences and letters how her childhood experiences affected her feelings, thoughts, and actions throughout her life:

6: Tomatic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Catherine Breshkovskaya]
[Bakunin]

How many times, stupefied and shocked, I have been the witness of such humiliating, degrading, excruciating things! How many times I have thrown myself at my father's feet to implore pardon for a so-called culprit, whose only fault, perhaps, was to have fallen asleep while herding the sheep! How many times I have been indignant to see how hundreds of peasants would be kept waiting in the courtyard, bare-headed and shivering with cold, waiting for the master to appear, after making them wait all day, would send them off without a word, so taken up was he with gambling at cards with other lords, who in their turn were making their coachmen wait on the carriage box till their hands were frozen! These things tormented my childish mind, and pursued me even into my bed, where I would lie awake for hours, unable to sleep for thinking of all the horrors about me. Child as I was, I could not understand why these honest folk should bear the entire burden of work and of taxes. I saw that my father, good though he was, put much more heart into looking after his own interests than the interests of his serfs, and I was shocked at the inequality between the rich and the poor. From the age of eight, how to find justice was the question that troubled me.[5]

Identification with suffering is outstanding in the literary works of Dostoyevsky. Influenced by religious feelings, he considered his own sufferings as a blessing. He identified Russia with crucified Christ and regarded the sufferings of the Russian people as a means by which the wrongs of all mankind will be expiated so that a new and better order will prevail on the earth: "All men will be holy and love one another, and there will be no more rich nor poor, no exulted nor humbled, but all will be as the children of God, and the true Kingdom of Christ will come."[6]

II

Not in all families of Russian intelligentsia was the situation alike. There were families in which harmonious relations prevailed. There were also families in which reaction developed not against the despotism of the father but against the tyranny of the mother. Bakunin, for instance, describes his mother as "a vain, egotistical woman and none of her children loved her."[7] According to Carr, Bakunin "attributed his passion for destruction to the influence of his mother, whose despotic character

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

[Bakunin]

[Saint Theodosius]

593 159 [668]

inspired him with an insensate hatred of every restriction on liberty."[8]

Identifying himself with all the oppressed, this leading Russian anarchist revolted not only against the family and the state, but against God as well, because God was a symbol of authority and fear. To Bakunin the concept of a God of fear implied abdication of reason and of justice, and was the negation of human liberty. He expounded therefore the overthrow of God as a necessary precondition of human liberation.[9] To Bakunin the revolt of Satan against God was the first attempt of free thought, of science, and of human freedom.[10]

Not unlike this was the reaction of Turgeniev toward the despotism of his mother. This outstanding Russian novelist apparently developed a great compassion for the Russian serfs and became a champion in the struggle for freedom and for the emancipation of the peasants because he identified his own sufferings with the plight of the muzhiks on the estate of his mother. Turgeniev's mother apparently gave vent both on her son and on her serfs for the sufferings of her unhappy married life, and in bringing up her own son she made few concessions. The same excessive strictness that she applied against serfs she exercised also against her own son. "I was flogged almost every day for merest trifles," says Turgeniev.[11] [538]

An earlier case of reaction against a despotic mother and resulting identification with those who are humiliated is that of Saint Theodosius. This Russian saint was one of the founders of Russian monasticism in the eleventh century. According to Fedotov, the main theme in the hagiography of Theodosius is the "strife with his mother . . . the cruel treatment he endured, and his threefold escape. Many scenes are painted with truly artistic skill, particularly the portrait sketched of the mother, with her passionate transitions from outbursts of anger to caresses, with her appearance as a virago: 'She was strong in body, vigorous as a man: anybody who would not have seen her but only heard her voice would believe it was that of a man.' "[12] 593 159 792

Theodosius reacted to the despotism of his mother by wearing "uncouth and patched garb" like the poor and the beggars to the dismay of his parents, who were well-to-do people and felt hor-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Saint Theodosius]

593 159 792 rified by such behavior. After his father's death, Theodosius used "to go to the fields with the slaves and work humbly."[13] Later when Theodosius finally escaped from his mother's tyranny by entering a monastery, he became the founder of that school of Russian monastic philosophy which emphasizes self-abnegation and meekness, as well as charitable love and compassion for those who suffer. In that manner Theodosius identified himself and his Church with all those who were tyrannized. But he was also active in protecting those to whom injustice was done. He became "intercessor for many before judges and princes, rescuing people."[14]

152 695 Deep sympathy for those who suffer and identification with them might explain why the Russian juries and the peasant courts were so ready to acquit the repentants. Juries and courts would often set free criminals who were found guilty by well established evidence. The verdict in such a case might be "not guilty" because of "commiseration for the poor murderer." A jury sitting through Holy Week would tend to acquit everybody, because "at the time of our Lord's Passion, it does not become Christians to condemn their brethren."[15]

152 538 Sympathy for those who suffer and identification with them is an outstanding trait of Russian literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Russian writings of those days exhibit a preoccupation with great social, political, religious and psychological problems of mankind. They picture a gloomy, painful, and tragic world, full of misery, injustice, blood and death. In the same manner the school textbooks of those days contained many heartbreaking stories full of compassion and commiseration for the suffering, unprotected, weak.

152 783 538 668 When identification with suffering is a manifestation of revolt or is combined with the urge for revolt, strong feelings of guilt might develop. On such grounds compulsion to suffer and to be persecuted might thrive. This "Russian Kenotism" is found among the early Russian monastics[16] as well as among the Russian nineteenth century revolutionaries and men of letters. Some Russian revolutionary factions, for instance, emphasized sacrifice and martyrdom to the point of self-destruction.[17] In the like manner Count Leo Tolstoy claims in his diary that he, "often

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

●593 154 517 Some Russian intellectuals, leaders and men of letters, such as Dobrolyubov, Ostrovsky, Herzen and Kropotkin were very much impressed by the effect which Russian family atmosphere had in shaping the personality of the Russian people, especially the intelligentsia. Herzen pointed out that in a family in which there was "much to hate and despise, and almost nothing to love and to respect," the psychological development was not full, but warped. In a similar manner Kropotkin explains that people who are brought up in families in which the personal relationships between children and their parents are based not on love and mutual respect but on fear and unconditional submission become both domineering and servile, as well as rebellious:

[861] A child's spirit is weak. It is so easy to coerce it by fear . . . They make the child timid, and they talk to him of the torments of hell. They conjur up before him the sufferings of the condemned, and vengeance of an implacable God . . . and by that habit of submission the thought of the next generation attains this religious twist, which is at once servile and authoritative; for authority and servility walk ever hand in hand. . . . Then the degradation of the ruler and of the judges, of the clergy and of the more or less comfortable classes becomes so revolting that the pendulum begins to swing the other way.[16]

The family environment, however, is itself an integral part of the society to which it belongs and is therefore interacting with it. Hence an understanding of the structure of the whole society, of the view of life, traditional culture and general orientation of its various strata, of the configuration of its interpersonal, institutional and power relationships is necessary in order to explain personality formation and peculiarities of behavior of a people.[17] It is in such a total context that also the direct and the indirect influences of physical environment or of any other "external" pressures might be correctly appraised.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Building on the traditional role of the Father in the Russian family the Party portrays the Party Leader as a strict and distant but also watchful and solicitous man who takes good care of his family. Following the traditional image of God and of the Father, the Party Leader is pictured as being benevolent toward those who submit to him unconditionally, but as being wrathful and merciless toward his foes and all those who disobey. And just like the members of the Great-Russian family, the Soviet people are expected to show "filial gratitude" to their Elder for his care and vigilance. Hence the supreme Party Leader is addressed as "our own father" (*rodnoy otets*), teacher (*uchitel*), leader (*vozhd*), friend (*drug*), and feeder (*kormilets*). Articles and letters of gratitude published daily in the Soviet press invariably mention his fatherly solicitude (*otecheskaya zabota*), his wise (*mudry*) plan and his genius (*geny*). Without fail they thank him ardently (*goryachee spasibo*) for what he has done for the well-being (*blago*), happiness (*schastie*), and world mightiness of the Soviet state (*velichaishaya derzhava mira*). On the occasion of the Leader's birthday numerous songs and musical compositions include titles which convey the idea of dependence upon and filial gratitude to an All-Powerful and All-Wise Vozhd.

It is expected that such identifications will reinforce in the Soviet people the feeling of guilt and make them redouble their efforts in building and supporting the Soviet system. Thus in the letters which various institutions, organizations and associations write to Vozhd, pledges are given to fulfill and overfulfill their quotas and to improve quality of products in gratitude for his unceasing "paternal care" and solicitude. And if they have failed, stayed behind, or have not come up to the expectations of their "father and teacher," they admit their guilt and promise to spare no efforts to improve, and thus arrest his wrath and rejection.[19] Not only lowly and humble folk from the bottom of the Soviet social pyramid, but men and women on the lofty peaks of Soviet arts and sciences, write such letters to Stalin in the same tone of religious reverence and humility, that strongly remind one both of the servility of Czarist official classes and of the prayers to an All-Mighty and wrathful God in the Russian Orthodox Church.

The ruling hierarchy realizes, however, that deification of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

strengthen the control of the Party over that fundamental social institution. This intent to completely subject the family to the Party's aims is expressed in Bolshevik ideological parlance as "the cultural-educational influence of the socialist state upon family relationships in the direction of strengthening socialist principles."[21]

II

Following Russian traditional attachment to the Mother Country, Soviet pedagogical principles demand that love for the *Rodina* should be emphasized in the training of children. Building on traditional mother-child attachment in the Russian family, the Party instructs teachers to point out to their pupils how Lenin was attached to his mother.[22] It also emphasizes the tender relations between Stalin and his mother. Teachers are told that this natural attachment of a child to his mother should be used as a means to instill in the child love for his Mother Country.[23]

At the same time in the school textbooks, in the daily press, in the speeches of Party leaders and all other means of mass communication, it is the Bolshevik Party that is represented to be the Mother of the Komsomols, Pioneers, and Octobrists, and the "mother of the Soviet people." The love for the Rodina is, therefore, interpreted as being conditioned by and subordinated to the primary duty of love for the Party or the Leader with whom the Party is identified. Hence, even when mother-attachment remains strong in a Soviet child, the attempt is made to transfer that attachment to the Party and to raise loyalty to the Leader and to the Party above loyalty to the country. Thus Party loyalty precedes both family and national loyalty in the Soviet educational philosophy. "Party is above everything else," the Bolsheviks say. And it is this loyalty to the Leader, Party or Cause which precedes all other loyalties that forms the core of Bolshevik internationalism and the basis of its world appeal, not unlike the appeal of a universal church.

Most children of elementary school age and a greater part of those on secondary school level belong to Party auxiliary organizations, the Octobrists, the Pioneers and the Komsomols. In the great variety of activities in which these organizations are ex-

6: Tomasi... E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

pected to help the Party "at all times," there is always a possibility of conflict between the demands of the Party and those of the family. Also, owing to a great shortage of manpower and a very low standard of living, most women, with the exception of those from the upper ruling strata, are forced to work long hours outside the home. Many of them have to engage in heavy physical labor. Such mothers are not only physically exhausted at the end of the day, but are often disillusioned, bitter, as well as critical of the system, a fact which is confirmed by a rather high percentage of women in convict labor camps. Such mothers cannot pay sufficient attention to their children.

At the same time great demands and responsibilities placed on parents in regard to the discipline of their children and the interference of the Party and the government in family affairs often causes harshness in treatment of children. Hence overstrictness as well as negligence of children is the result.[24] Such a situation favors both feelings of rejection and revolt, as well as extreme self-concern and destructive aggressiveness on a larger scale and in a more intense way than in the days of Czardom. And since the Soviet system of vigilance encourages family members to inform on one another, mutual suspicions, fears, and hostilities rooted in patriarchal traditions are greatly magnified. Training in self-confidence and trust, and in group attachment cannot thrive in such circumstances. But it is exactly self-concern, mistrust, and destructive aggression that are so instrumental in the perpetuation of the Bolshevik rule.

Unstable political and economic conditions, together with consequences of wars, depletion of rural areas of adult men, famines, convict labor camps to which millions of parents have been confined, have resulted in an unprecedented number of broken families and a growing number of neglected, illegitimate and delinquent children. A number of such children, especially orphans of war heroes, at the age of nine are sent to military schools. Many neglected and delinquent children at the age of 3 to 13 are sent to special homes for children which are in charge of the secret political police.[25] The increasing stress on internal vigilance, together with the pressing need of the political police to feed their vast economic enterprises with cheap

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

000 authorities as soon as these showed signs of weakness and defeat.

Could it be that lack of acceptance, thwarted and unstable attachments in the Soviet system of rule will bring about the same results? And will the fanaticism, cynicism, and extreme self-concern cause the Soviet "Oprichniki" to play as fateful a role in their own day as their predecessors did in theirs? Will such "Janizaries" become the spearheads of a new plan for world conquest, in the name of a new Allah? Or will they bring about internal chaos and anarchy as soon as their personal power is imperilled? Increasing complaints against misappropriation of public funds and properties, venality of government officials and Party members indicate such possibilities. Disrespect for personal rights on the part of the government bureaucracy and the military, emphasis on hatred in the educational system and the press, and inhuman practices of the political police point in the same direction.

593 [672] On the other hand, the same pressures that work in the direction of family tension and of breaking up of family ties might, in certain circumstances, strengthen family attachments and family solidarity. In the police practices of the Soviet Union all those who had any ties (*svyaz*) with a political culprit are suspected of the same crime. It is this philosophy of implied culpability that leads to the principle of joint family responsibility and family hostages in case of political offenses by one family member. It appears that a number of "confessions" in the political trials were the result of a promise on the part of the secret police that the family members of the victim will be spared. Such conditions of consistent external threat if combined with indifference toward Soviet efforts might foster the tendency to withdraw within one's own family circle, to keep the outside contacts to a minimum, and to strengthen the intimacies of the home.

In those cases when changes in family relations take such a trend, the status of the father apparently assumes a different position and function from that which was typical of the Great-Russian patriarchal family system in the past. Instead of the strictness and detachment which characterized the father's role

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

in that family, the new circumstances call for more leniency and more intimacy on his part toward his wife and his children. The mother at the same time, because now closer to her husband, is in no need to become over-attached to her children. Such well-balanced family relations come to closely resemble those in the Old-Slavonic family.

It is the children with such close family ties in an emotionally balanced family atmosphere that develop traits of moderation, self-control, responsibility, group orientation and humane feelings. It is in such families that patriotism, idealization of the past and longing for a more humane and more equalitarian political system are nursed.[28] In such families skepticism concerning Bolshevik mythology and opposition to Soviet system may be safely expressed. In such families also religion is cultivated or secretly practiced.[29] In such families apparently numerous anecdotes which ridicule Soviet regime circulate and are spread throughout the Soviet Union.[30] It is to break such family intimacy and solidarity which breed opposition to their regime that the Bolsheviks have shown increasing concern for the control of family relations.

But if the opposition to the Bolshevik regime centers in such families of patriots and humanists, the fate of the Soviet system might rest upon them, in the final analysis. These people might be reluctant to support a Soviet war of aggression led by careerists and fanatics, but ready to defend their Mother Country in the event of hostile aggression from the outside. However, in a war against the Soviet Union which the patriots and the humanists would interpret as a war of liberation from the oppressive, inhuman and destructive policies of Soviet rulers, they might be inclined to take the side of the invading liberators. Inasmuch as such people already find themselves at the fringes of Soviet power structure as specialists and experts in economic management and government administration, in times of crisis the shift of power to these people could easily take place.

Such a trend of development will be even more emphasized among the oppressed, but nationally-conscious minorities, than among the dominant Great-Russians. Millions of Soviet subjects who willingly gave themselves up to the German invaders and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

welcomed them as liberators in World War II, indicate such possibilities.

III

In studying personality growth in the Soviet society, one should take into account also the differences between the urban and the rural environments and the influences of those environments on interpersonal relations within the family circle. Owing to the very rapid pace of urbanization and low rate of production of consumption goods, most of the families located in the urban areas are exposed to the housing shortage and lack of home privacy. Many of these families live in community apartments in which there is only one room per family and in which a number of unrelated families share a common kitchen and toilet facilities. Family conflicts and tensions tend to be intensified in such circumstances. Lack of privacy, noisiness, and lack of sleep in crowded quarters, together with the lack of sufficient food, long hours of work and unsatisfactory conditions of work increase dissatisfactions and magnify existing family conflicts. An outlet for dissatisfactions is found then in trivial scandals and bickering, in petty squabbles, but also in violent emotional outbursts.[31]

Conditions in rural areas are somewhat different. Though virtually all peasant families live in one or at most two-room cottages, which they often share with a few heads of livestock, yet the rural family does have its own privacy. Most peasant families possess a small lot of land around the cottage, on which they raise some poultry or a pig; some might even own a cow. Though this is all very modest, yet with some labor, after the work for the kolhoz has been done, the peasant family has been able to raise some food on its own property and perhaps to sell it on the open market and then buy some clothing and other bare necessities.[32]

Compared to the situation of the city worker, the peasant, though receiving lower wages for his work, and often going in rags, perhaps does feel relatively more independent. If he is an adult with a family he is much less likely to be pushed around, though he is constantly exhorted by kolhoz officials to work more

7: Lineva B-5 (no date)1893 RFl Great Russia RFl

539

In my native country lives my stern father;
He was harsh and had no pity on me.
He forbade me to walk out in the evening;
I disobeyed my father and pleased my lover."

This song is greatly liked at dancing parties amongst the peasants, but it really was not a dancing song originally. While the time is quick and lively, still there can be heard in it an undercurrent of sadness, and this combination of two opposing feelings is also expressed in the words of the song.

A young woman remembers her former home, from which she escaped against the wishes of her stern father, who did not allow her to atttend the social gatherings of her friends. Her present life with her husband seems to be a happy one, and this strain predominates in the tune, and she wants the falcon to go to her father and tell him so; but then she also has a feeling of homesickness, which can be heard beneath the rollicking tune. [593]

The simplicity of the melody gives it great strength, but it also contains the danger of being easily made trivial by an unfeeling execution.

---

10. KAMARINSKAYA.

What a queer fellow you are Kamarinsky peasant,
As you run stumbling along the street!
"I am running to the rumshop, with a headache.—
Without drinking a peasant can not live."

One of the favorite male dancing songs; the words are humorous, but rather coarse, so that but one verse can be given here, and even that one slightly modified.

---

11. THE MEADOWS.

(*Vo loosiakh.*)

In the meadows, in the green meadows,
There grew soft, silky grass,
There bloomed little blue flowers,
There spread sweet odors.
On that grass I will feed my horse,
I will feed it and comb it:
I will put on its silver bridle,